

## **Program A: Administration**

Program Authorization: La. Constitution, Article X, Sections 16-20; Louisiana Revised Statutes 33:2471 et seq. and 33:2531 et seq. Funding for the Office of State Examiner is provided through R.S. 22:1419(A) relative to the creation of the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Operating Fund.

### **PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

The mission of the Administration Program (organizationally expressed as the Office of State Examiner, Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service) is to administer an effective, cost-efficient civil service system based on merit, efficiency, fitness, and length of service, consistent with the law and professional standards, for firefighters and police officers in all municipalities in the state having populations of not less than 7,000 nor more than 400,000 inhabitants, and in all parish fire departments and fire protection districts regardless of population, in order to provide a continuity in quality in law enforcement and fire protection for citizens of the state in both rural and urban areas.

The goals of the Administration Program are:

1. Administer valid tests of fitness, developed according to professionally acceptable standards, for classifications in the municipalities or fire protection districts, and furnish the results to the respective civil service boards for their approval.
2. Assist local civil service boards in providing an orderly system of personnel management that functions in accordance with civil service law.
3. Provide information and support to local civil service boards, governing authorities, appointing authorities, department chief executive officers, and classified employees regarding the duties imposed upon them by the provisions of the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service Law.

The Administration Program includes three major activities: Testing, Personnel Management, and Administrative Support.

- **Testing:** The Office of State Examiner provides testing in the local jurisdictions for both competitive and promotional appointments. Legal requirements and professionally acceptable standards require that such tests be validated and supported by adequate documentation. There are several types of validation strategies, but the underlying principle of validation is that the knowledge, skills, and abilities measured by employment selection tests should be substantially related to those skills necessary in order to perform the job for which evaluation is being conducted. This poses a unique problem for the Office of State Examiner in that the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System contains a wide range of department sizes based upon the needs of the respective jurisdictions. While the rank structure in both fire and police departments may appear to be fairly standard with common class titles in the respective services in most jurisdictions, there is actually a wide variation in the assignment of duties and responsibilities. The job of Police Lieutenant in Abbeville or Minden, for example, may be vastly different from the job of Police Lieutenant in Shreveport or Baton Rouge.

There are two types of examinations prepared by the Office of State Examiner (OSE): those developed for use across multiple jurisdictions and those custom-designed for a specific use in a single jurisdiction. The foundation of the exam development process for both types of examinations is a comprehensive job analysis that identifies the distinguishing responsibilities assigned by the appointing authority to the respective classes under his or her control. Regardless of whether the number of positions being analyzed is large or small, standard job analysis techniques require the job to be broken down into individual elements called "tasks," which, when combined, form a complete picture of all the duties that might be assigned to a specific class of positions. The tasks are generally presented in questionnaire format to experienced incumbents in the class being evaluated. The questionnaire respondents are asked to evaluate each task by means of scales for importance, frequency of performance, consequence of error for failing to perform the task correctly, and whether or not the incumbent needed to have the knowledge or ability to perform the task from the first day on the job. Whenever the job analysis surveys a sample of the population from a large class, every attempt is made to representatively sample all relevant race/sex subgroups and applicable working units. The aggregate of responses for all questionnaire respondents in the jurisdiction provides a clear picture of the job as it is performed in that department and what knowledge, skills, and abilities are needed in order to begin a working test period in the class.

- **Personnel Management:** The OSE assists civil service boards in reviewing appointments and personnel movements for compliance with civil service law. Records are maintained on all personnel actions reported for each employee within the system. A fundamental function of the personnel management activity is assisting the respective local civil service boards in developing and maintaining a uniform and comprehensive classification plan within each department. As is the case with the testing function, the foundation of the classification activity is the job analysis.

- Administrative Support: The OSE provides administrative support to local civil service board members, appointing authorities, departmental chiefs, governing bodies, and employees in the system in making the system operational at the local level. OSE personnel are readily available by telephone, through correspondence, or at meetings to respond to the many questions posed to the office. The OSE also provides original orientation and guidance to governing authorities who are required by law to establish systems and provides orientation and assistance to newly sworn boards in making the system operational at the local level. Training is provided to local boards, chiefs, secretaries, and other interested individuals through regional seminars conducted by agency personnel. *Operation of a Civil Service System*, a comprehensive operational manual published by the OSE, is distributed at the seminars and made available upon request to those at the local level. Other information is conveyed to local jurisdictions through mass mailings or *The Examiner*, the OSE newsletter. Finally, the OSE provides 24-hour access to information through both a voice mail system and the agency Internet website.

GENERAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION: MUNICIPAL FIRE AND POLICE CIVIL SERVICE					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1994-95	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1995-96	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1996-97	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1997-98	PRIOR YEAR ACTUAL FY 1998-99
Number of jurisdictions in Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service (MF&PCS) system	88	90	92	93	94
Number of covered employees in MF&PCS system	6,866	7,036	7,306	7,404	7,434
Ratio of Office of State Examiner staff to covered employees in MF&PCS system	1:491 <sup>1</sup>	1:469 <sup>1</sup>	1:487 <sup>1</sup>	1:436 <sup>2</sup>	1:437 <sup>2</sup>
Cost per covered employee within MF&PCS system <sup>3</sup>	\$94	\$94	\$93	\$102 <sup>4</sup>	\$111 <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Office of State Examiner staff = 15.

<sup>2</sup> Office of State Examiner staff = 17.

<sup>3</sup> This performance indicator is determined by dividing actual expenditures by the number of employees within the system.

<sup>4</sup> The agency had a carry forward in the amount of \$23,375 for legal and professional services contracts.

<sup>5</sup> Includes \$27,000 added to agency budget by BA-7 for Y2K computer upgrade.

## OBJECTIVES AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Unless otherwise indicated, all objectives are to be accomplished during or by the end of FY 2000-2001. Performance indicators are made up of two parts: name and value. The indicator name describes what is being measured. The indicator value is the numeric value or level achieved within a given measurement period. For budgeting purposes, performance indicator values are shown for the prior fiscal year, the current fiscal year, and alternative funding scenarios (continuation budget level and Executive Budget recommendation level) for the ensuing fiscal year (the fiscal year of the budget document).

**The objectives and performance indicators that appear below are associated with program funding in the Base Executive Budget for FY 2000-01. Specific information on program funding is presented in the financial sections that follow performance tables.**

1. (KEY) To reduce the amount of time between the date an exam request is received and the date grades are mailed to civil service boards from the FY 1998-99 average of 88 days to an average of 86 days.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is an incremental step in accomplishing Strategic Objective I.1, which targets reducing the average time between the date the exam request is received in the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service office and the date the grades are mailed to the jurisdiction from 88 days to 78 days by June 30, 2003.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of exams administered	375	472	423	423	450	450
K	Number of candidates tested	5,400	4,571	5,943	5,943	5,400	5,400
K	Average number of days between receipt of exam request and mailing of grades	88 <sup>1</sup>	88	85	85	83	86 <sup>2</sup>
S	Average number of days between receipt of exam request and date of exam	77	71	74	74	71	71
S	Average number of days between exam and mailing of grades	11	17	11	11	12	15 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Although this was a new performance indicator that did not appear under Act 19, it is an aggregate of two indicators that did appear under Act 19. As a result, the FY 1998-99 performance standard can be determined.

<sup>2</sup> The proposed performance standard at recommended budget level reflects a smaller improvement in services than at the continuation budget level. The agency's continuation level budget included an adjustment to add two employees to accommodate the agency's increased workload. However, these two positions are not included in the Executive Budget recommendations.

Explanatory Note: The Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) requires that the Office of the State Examiner provide reasonable accommodations in the testing environment for candidates with bona fide disabilities that affect significant life activities. In processing these requests, the Office of State Examiner (OSE) asks that the local civil service board, to which the application for accommodation has been made, obtain proof of the candidate's disability from a physician or other recognized disability professional. At the local civil service board's request, the OSE provides accommodations reasonable to the respective disability. This may include a private examining room for an applicant who has been diagnosed with attention

deficit hyperactivity disorder, a reader and extra time for an applicant with dyslexia (which also requires a private examination setting as the reader would disturb other candidates), or the translation of the test into a braille format for an applicant with a visual impairment. The application of this law presents a particularly troubling problem for the OSE in that the job analysis conducted for all of its competitive classes had identified the ability to read as an essential ability on the job. By allowing the test to be read to an applicant, this critical skill is not being assessed. Yet the OSE has no way of knowing if the respective department could accommodate such a disability. In addition, having a low IQ has also been identified as a permanent disability that significantly affects major life activities, a problem that is particularly troubling when assessing candidates for public safety employment, where successful candidates might be making critical life and death decisions. Until such time as further clarification on the application of this law is provided at the federal level, the OSE must continue to carefully evaluate each request for accommodations on a case-by-case basis. Although the OSE has been successful in most cases in securing additional help from the respective jurisdictions in the administration of these examinations, most ADA requests require a private examination setting and additional OSE personnel. The OSE has had several instances of multiple requests for accommodation for the same examination time, and in one case, the OSE was required to send four examiners for an examination that could have been administered under normal circumstances with only one OSE employee. While it has proven somewhat difficult to anticipate the number of ADA requests that will be received in a given year, and actual requests have declined over the past year, the OSE must be prepared to respond to such situations when the need arises.

To preserve the integrity of the examination process, state law requires that examinations be administered to all the candidates at the same time and under the same conditions. As a protective public safety measure, state law also requires that the examinations be administered in the jurisdiction for which testing is done. While this causes extensive travel time for OSE examining personnel, the city or fire protection district is not left with a serious manpower shortage due to the candidates for a promotional examination being tested miles away at a regional testing center. Examinations may be stopped at any time such a local emergency occurs.

2. (KEY) To improve the validity and legal defensibility of standard examinations by completing the content validation of 2 standard, multi-jurisdictional exams.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is an incremental step toward accomplishing Strategic Objective 1.2, which targets the completion of validation studies for 100% of the 11 standard examinations by June 30, 2003.

Explanatory Note: Legal requirements and professionally acceptable standards require that tests be validated and supported by adequate documentation. There are several types of validation strategies, but the underlying principle of validation is that the knowledge, skills, and abilities measured by employment selection tests should be substantially related to those skills necessary in order to perform the job for which evaluation is being conducted. Three standard, multijurisdictional exams that are candidates for content validation in FY 2000-01 are Fire Driver, Fire Communications Officer, and Jailer.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of validation studies conducted on standard multi-jurisdictional exams	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	2 <sup>2</sup>	3 <sup>3</sup>	3 <sup>3</sup>	3	2 <sup>4</sup>
K	Number of challenges to standard examinations where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity finds that a standard examination administered by the Office of the State Examiner was not appropriate <sup>5</sup>	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	0	1	1	1	2 <sup>6</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> This was a new performance indicator for FY 1998-99. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no performance standard for FY 1998-99.
- <sup>2</sup> The Police Officer exam was completed by June 1999 and documentation is currently being finalized.
- <sup>3</sup> Validation studies scheduled for FY 1999-00 include the criterion validation of the Firefighter examination, the content validation of the Department Records Clerk examination, and the content validation of the Secretary to the Fire/Police Chiefs examination. The Office of State Examiner is currently behind schedule on the Firefighter criterion project and other validation efforts because of understaffing.
- <sup>4</sup> The proposed performance standard at recommended budget level reflects a smaller improvement in services than at the continuation budget level. The agency's continuation level budget included an adjustment to add two employees to accommodate the agency's increased workload. However, these two positions are not included in the Executive Budget recommendations.
- <sup>5</sup> "Other regulatory entity" may be defined as the U.S. Department of Justice or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The wording of the performance indicator has been changed from prior years to more appropriately reflect quality. Many who fail an exam will complain, but the measure of this program's success should be in the resolution of such complaints when reviewed by the appropriate objective entity.
- <sup>6</sup> The proposed performance standard at recommended budget level reflects an increased potential for successful challenges to standard examinations than at the continuation budget level. The agency's continuation level budget included a request to fund a professional services contract for an industrial/organizational psychologist. However, funding for this professional services contract is not included in the Executive Budget recommendations. The agency indicates that lack of this position will result in an increased number of challenges to standard examinations where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity finds that a standard examination administered by the Office of State Examiner was not appropriate.

3. (KEY) To maintain the average time between the job analysis and the date of the examination for nonstandard, custom-developed exams at 1.9 years.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is an incremental step toward accomplishing Strategic Objective I.3, which targets improvement of the quality and validity of the nonstandard examinations by June 30, 2003, by reducing the average time between the job analysis and the date of the exam from 2 years to 1.5 years for custom developed examinations.

Explanatory Note: Some job analysis studies are conducted immediately prior to the administration of the test (which would result in a value of approximately 0.25 year as a measure of the recent nature of the job analysis), whereas some job analysis studies are used to develop a second or sometimes third exam prior to reanalyzing the class. The latter situation would result in a value of 3-4 years for this indicator. The strategic objective is to reduce the average time to 1.5 years by June 30, 2003.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of nonstandard, custom-developed exams prepared	175	175	212	212	215	215
K	Average number of years from job analysis to date of nonstandard, custom-developed exam	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.75	1.9 <sup>2</sup>
K	Number of challenges to custom-developed examinations where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity finds that an examination developed and administered by the Office of the State Examiner was not appropriate <sup>3</sup>	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	0	1	1	1	2 <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This was a new performance indicator for FY 1998-99. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no performance standard for FY 1998-99.

<sup>2</sup> The proposed performance standard at recommended budget level reflects a smaller improvement in services than at the continuation budget level. The agency's continuation level budget included an adjustment to add two employees to accommodate the agency's increased workload. However, these two positions are not included in the Executive Budget recommendations. As a result, the agency anticipates that the average number of years from job analysis to date of nonstandard, custom-developed exam in FY 2000-01 will remain at the FY 1999-00 performance standard.

<sup>3</sup> "Other regulatory entity" may be defined as the U.S. Department of Justice or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The wording of the performance indicator has been changed from prior years to more appropriately reflect quality. Many who fail an exam will complain, but the measure of this program's success should be in the resolution of such complaints when reviewed by the appropriate objective entity.

<sup>4</sup> The proposed performance standard at recommended budget level reflects an increased potential for successful challenges to custom-developed examinations than at the continuation budget level. The agency's continuation level budget included an request to fund a professional services contract for an industrial/organizational psychologist. However, funding for this professional services contract is not included in the Executive Budget recommendations. The agency indicates that lack of this position will result in an increased number of challenges to custom-developed examinations where a civil service board, court, or other regulatory entity finds that a standard examination administered by the Office of State Examiner was not appropriate.

Explanatory Note: The OSE has determined that, with a few exceptions, the duties assigned to those classes above the rank of Police Sergeant in the police service and Fire Captain in the fire service are so different between jurisdictions that they warrant the construction of unique examinations for specific uses in each jurisdiction. Therefore, the second category of tests prepared by the OSE is custom designed tests for specific classes in each jurisdiction. The relatively small numbers of applicants tested by means of custom-designed examinations does not permit the extensive statistical analysis that is possible with multi-jurisdictional examinations. On the other hand, the process of custom designing an examination to evaluate the specific knowledge and skills needed to perform the unique set of duties assigned to a class of positions in a single jurisdiction increases the content validity of the examination. In layman's terms, this means that the examination presumably will be a better predictor of success on the job since the OSE is evaluating only that body of knowledge necessary to perform work in the class in a specific setting. This custom-designed testing format allows the OSE to be sensitive to the needs of both large and small jurisdictions and departments with unique organizational structure needs. In other words, the examination for Police Lieutenant in Abbeville (which will reflect the duties assigned to the class in that city) will be substantially different from the test for Police Lieutenant in Shreveport (which will reflect the duties assigned to the class in that city) despite the fact that the classes have a common name.



4. (KEY) To maintain the percentage of personnel action forms that must be returned to the local jurisdictions for correction at 7.5% through education and training of key individuals.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is an incremental step toward accomplishing Strategic Objective II.1, which aims to increase the accuracy, through training, with which personnel actions are made and reported by the local jurisdictions by reducing the percentage of personnel action forms that must be returned for correction from 8.25% to 6.25% by June 30, 2003.

Explanatory Note: The Office of State Examiner (OSE) assists civil service boards in reviewing appointments and personnel movements for compliance with civil service law. Records are maintained on all personnel actions reported for each employee within the system. Appointing authorities are required to report appointments, promotions, demotions, and disciplinary actions to their local civil service board within 15 days. The OSE provides a standard personnel action form to local entities to facilitate the reporting of this information in a timely manner. Local civil service boards, in turn, report the actions to the OSE via a copy of the executed personnel action form.

The OSE is not targeting additional improvement for FY 2000-01. Rather, the office is setting a maintenance level objective in anticipation of an increase in problem personnel action forms (PAFs) resulting from changes established during the 1999 legislative session. Actions of the 1997 legislature introduced the "recruit" status prior to beginning the working test period. Action in the 1999 session changed the classes to which this provision applies, as well as the time and conditions of the recruit period. Considerable confusion has arisen among those preparing PAFs. This, in turn, has produced an increase in problems that must be addressed by the OSE. The OSE intends to anticipate and mitigate problems through training seminars, newsletters, and informational mass mailings.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of personnel action forms (PAFs) reviewed for compliance with civil service law	5,100	4,834	5,175	5,175	5,175	5,175
K	Number of PAFs returned to jurisdictions for corrections because of errors in application of civil service law	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	393	390	390	390	390
K	Percentage of PAFs reviewed that are returned for correction	8.0%	8.1%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%

<sup>1</sup> This was a new performance indicator for FY 1998-99. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no performance standard for FY 1998-99.

5. (KEY) To assist local civil service boards in maintaining their respective class plans by maintaining an average time of 180 days between the date a class plan change is initiated or requested and the date the completed change is forwarded to the local civil service board.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is an incremental step toward accomplishing Strategic Objective II.2, which aims to reduce the average time between the date a new or revised class specification is initiated or requested and the date the new or revised class specification is recommended to the civil service board from an average of 199 days to 125 days by June 30, 2003.

Explanatory Note: A class plan consists of all of the classification specifications for the respective classes of positions within a jurisdiction. Therefore this objective and the following performance indicators refer to changes to existing class specifications as well as new classes added to the class plan. The wording of this objective was changed slightly from that which appeared in the strategic plan for both clarity and brevity.

Explanatory Note: A fundamental function of the personnel management activity is assisting respective local civil service boards in developing and maintaining a uniform and comprehensive classification plan within each department. As is the case with the testing function, the foundation of the classification activity is the job analysis. Standard job analysis techniques are employed by the Office of State Examiner (OSE) to evaluate the duties assigned to the various positions by the appointing authority. Homogeneous positions are grouped as a class of positions. A class description for each class of positions is developed by the OSE. Class descriptions include a general description of the distinguishing features of the class, examples of the major duties, and qualification requirements. New or revised classification descriptions are provided to respective local civil service boards, which, following a required 30-day posting period, conduct public hearings on the adoption of the new or revised class description into their respective class plans as rules of the board.

Once adopted, the class descriptions within the jurisdiction's class plan serve as a basis for determining eligibility for competitive and promotional examinations, as well as for allocating future positions created by the appointing authority to their respective classes in the classified service.

The OSE initiates classification plan changes or development when recent job analysis evaluations indicate that such changes or development are necessary, to reflect changes in departmental structure initiated by the appointing authority, or when necessitated by changes in federal or state law.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
K	Number of revisions to class plans forwarded to local civil service boards	268	203	275	275	225	200 <sup>2</sup>
K	Average number of days between the date a class plan change is requested or initiated and the date the completed change is forwarded to the local civil service board	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	199	170	170	160	180 <sup>3</sup>

- <sup>1</sup> This was a new performance indicator for FY 1998-99. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no performance standard for FY 1998-99.
- <sup>2</sup> The proposed performance standard at recommended budget level reflects a less desirable service level than at the continuation budget level. The agency's continuation level budget included an adjustment to add two employees to accommodate the agency's increased workload. However, these two positions are not included in the Executive Budget recommendations. As a result, the agency anticipates that, in FY 2000-01, the number of revisions to class plans forwarded to local civil service boards will drop to 200. This would be less than the FY 1999-00 standard (275) but nearly the same as the FY 1998-99 actual (203).
- <sup>3</sup> The proposed performance standard at recommended budget level reflects a less desirable service level than at the continuation budget level. The agency's continuation level budget included an adjustment to add two employees to accommodate the agency's increased workload. However, these two positions are not included in the Executive Budget recommendations. As a result, the agency anticipates that, in FY 2000-01, the average number of days between the date a class plan change is requested or initiated and the date the completed change is forwarded to the local civil service board will increase to 180. Although this is ten days greater than the FY 1999-00 performance standard (190 days), it is still lower than the FY 1998-99 actual (199 days).

6. (SUPPORTING) To improve the administrative support afforded all jurisdictions in the local operation of their respective systems.

Strategic Link: This operational objective is an incremental step toward accomplishing Strategic Objective III.1 (To improve the administrative support afforded all jurisdictions in the local operation of their respective systems by June 30, 2003, through making needed information and support more readily available.).

Explanatory Note: Civil service board members serve without compensation and most have little or no personnel administration experience. The membership of most civil service boards changes on a fairly frequent basis due, in part, to the nature of the staggered appointments. Therefore, to expect the board membership to develop the necessary expertise to administer the civil service system without support is unrealistic. Local boards depend heavily upon the support system provided by the state through the Office of State Examiner (OSE). In addition to the services described above, the OSE provides administrative support and advice in setting up new jurisdictions, conducting meetings and hearings, adopting rules, and following civil service law as it applied to promotions, appointments, disciplinary actions, appeals, and political activity. The OSE also monitors changes in federal and state law, relevant case law, and attorney general opinions that impact the operation of the jurisdictions; the OSE provides timely advice when operational changes are necessary.

Explanatory Note: To accomplish the operational objective cited above, the OSE will provide support, information, and advice to governing and appointing authorities, department officers, civil service boards, board secretaries, and classified employees within the system on the operation of the system in accordance with civil service law; provide training seminars for 25 jurisdictions; and increase the usefulness of the agency web site.

LEVEL	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR NAME	PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES					
		YEAREND PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1998-1999	ACTUAL YEAREND PERFORMANCE FY 1998-1999	ACT 10 PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	EXISTING PERFORMANCE STANDARD FY 1999-2000	AT CONTINUATION BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001	AT RECOMMENDED BUDGET LEVEL FY 2000-2001
S	Number of civil service board minutes reviewed	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	505	430	430	500	500
S	Number of <i>Operation of a Civil Service System</i> manuals distributed <sup>2</sup>	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	170	100	100	125	125
S	Number of issues of <i>The Examiner</i> distributed <sup>3</sup>	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	131	700 <sup>4</sup>	700 <sup>4</sup>	150 <sup>5</sup>	150 <sup>5</sup>
S	Number of civil service board meetings or hearings attended by Office of State Examiner personnel	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	9	38 <sup>6</sup>	38 <sup>6</sup>	20 <sup>6</sup>	20 <sup>6</sup>
S	Number of jurisdictions attending training seminars	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	42	33	33	25	25
S	Number of individuals trained as a result of seminars or individual orientation	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	109	160	160	150	150
S	Number of informational categories on the OSE web site	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	14	25	25	26	26
S	Number of study guides on agency website	Not applicable <sup>1</sup>	Not applicable <sup>7</sup>	40	40	215	215

- <sup>1</sup> This was a new performance indicator for FY 1998-99. It did not appear under Act 19 of 1998 and has no performance standard for FY 1998-99.
- <sup>2</sup> *Operation of a Civil Service System*, a comprehensive operational manual prepared by the Office of State Examiner (OSE), is distributed at OSE seminars and also is made available upon request to those at the local level.
- <sup>3</sup> *The Examiner*, a newsletter prepared by the OSE, provides information on changes in civil service law impacting the Municipal Fire and Police Civil Service System.
- <sup>4</sup> This standard reflects the type of legislative session (full, general session in which many changes to civil service law occurred) in 1999.
- <sup>5</sup> FY 2000-01 values reflect the type of legislative session (shorter, fiscal only session in which changes to civil service law are not expected) in 2000.
- <sup>6</sup> In FY 1997-98 there were 39 civil service hearings; as a result, the OSE projected 38 civil service hearings for FY 1999-00. Due to staffing problems, the OSE has provided needed services to boards through correspondence and telephone communications and limited attendance at meetings to those times when attendance is absolutely necessary or when an OSE staff member has been subpoenaed. This management strategy was necessary to maintain operations at a continuation level. It is anticipated that staffing problems will continue into the next fiscal year. As a result, it is anticipated that fewer civil service board meetings will be attended by OSE personnel.
- <sup>7</sup> This is a new initiative that began in FY 1999-00.

## RESOURCE ALLOCATION FOR THE PROGRAM

	ACTUAL 1998-1999	ACT 10 1999- 2000	EXISTING 1999- 2000	CONTINUATION 2000 - 2001	RECOMMENDED 2000 - 2001	RECOMMENDED OVER/(UNDER) EXISTING
MEANS OF FINANCING:						
STATE GENERAL FUND (Direct)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
STATE GENERAL FUND BY:						
Interagency Transfers	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fees & Self-gen. Revenues	0	0	0	0	0	0
Statutory Dedications	825,154	895,614	921,195	944,986	943,290	22,095
Interim Emergency Board	0	0	0	0	0	0
FEDERAL FUNDS	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL MEANS OF FINANCING	<b>\$825,154</b>	<b>\$895,614</b>	<b>\$921,195</b>	<b>\$944,986</b>	<b>\$943,290</b>	<b>\$22,095</b>
EXPENDITURES & REQUEST:						
Salaries	\$555,074	\$602,912	\$602,912	\$633,302	\$630,674	\$27,762
Other Compensation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Related Benefits	105,608	141,048	141,048	145,238	149,289	8,241
Total Operating Expenses	109,249	118,435	123,055	120,199	113,532	(9,523)
Professional Services	17,964	0	20,961	10,000	10,000	(10,961)
Total Other Charges	4,945	5,451	5,451	5,508	5,899	448
Total Acq. & Major Repairs	32,314	27,768	27,768	30,739	33,896	6,128
TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND REQUEST	<b>\$825,154</b>	<b>\$895,614</b>	<b>\$921,195</b>	<b>\$944,986</b>	<b>\$943,290</b>	<b>\$22,095</b>
AUTHORIZED FULL-TIME						
EQUIVALENTS: Classified	17	17	17	17	17	0
Unclassified	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>

## SOURCE OF FUNDING

This program is funded with Statutory Dedications derived from "two hundredths of one percent of the gross direct insurance premiums received in the state, in the preceding year, by insurers doing business in the state." (Per R.S. 39:32B.(8), see table below for a listing of expenditures out of each Statutory Dedicated fund.)

	ACTUAL	ACT 10	EXISTING	CONTINUATION	RECOMMENDED	RECOMMENDED
	1998-1999	1999- 2000	1999- 2000	2000 - 2001	2000 - 2001	OVER/(UNDER)
						EXISTING
Municipal Fire & Police Civil Service Operating Fund	\$825,154	\$895,614	\$921,195	\$944,986	\$943,290	\$22,095

## ANALYSIS OF RECOMMENDATION

GENERAL FUND	TOTAL	T.O.	DESCRIPTION
\$0	\$895,614	17	<b>ACT 10 FISCAL YEAR 1999-2000</b>
			<b>BA-7 TRANSACTIONS:</b>
\$0	\$25,581	0	Carry forward professional services expenses for attorney 's fees, computer contract, and completion of firefighters validation project
\$0	\$921,195	17	<b>EXISTING OPERATING BUDGET – December 3, 1999</b>
\$0	\$14,263	0	Annualization of FY 1999-2000 Classified State Employees Merit Increase
\$0	\$17,331	0	Classified State Employees Merit Increases for FY 2000-2001
\$0	(\$489)	0	Risk Management Adjustment
\$0	\$29,933	0	Acquisitions & Major Repairs
\$0	(\$27,768)	0	Non-Recurring Acquisitions & Major Repairs
\$0	(\$25,581)	0	Non-Recurring Carry Forwards
\$0	\$57	0	Legislative Auditor Fees
\$0	(\$2,991)	0	Salary Base Adjustment
\$0	\$391	0	Civil Service Fees
\$0	\$2,986	0	Other Adjustments - Training series reallocations
\$0	\$10,000	0	Other Adjustments - Legal fees
\$0	\$3,963	0	Other Adjustments - Computer equipment for implementation of ISIS/Human Resources/Payroll project
\$0	\$943,290	17	<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED</b>
\$0	\$0	0	<b>LESS GOVERNOR'S SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
\$0	\$943,290	17	<b>BASE EXECUTIVE BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 2000-2001</b>
			<b>SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON SALES TAX RENEWAL:</b>
\$0	\$0	0	None
\$0	\$0	0	<b>TOTAL SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON SALES TAX RENEWAL</b>

			SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON NEW REVENUE:
\$0	\$0	0	None
<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>TOTAL SUPPLEMENTARY RECOMMENDATIONS CONTINGENT ON NEW REVENUE</b>
<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$943,290</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>GRAND TOTAL RECOMMENDED</b>

The total means of financing for this program is recommended at 102.4% of the existing operating budget. It represents 93.4% of the total request (\$1,010,088) for this program. Significant adjustments include increased funding for salaries and related benefits and increased funding for legal expenses.

## PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

\$10,000	Legal services
<b>\$10,000</b>	<b>TOTAL PROFESSIONAL SERVICES</b>

## OTHER CHARGES

\$3,011	Legislative auditor expenses
<b>\$3,011</b>	<b>SUB-TOTAL OTHER CHARGES</b>
	<b>Interagency Transfers:</b>
\$2,888	Civil Service/CPTP charges
<b>\$2,888</b>	<b>SUB-TOTAL INTERAGENCY TRANSFERS</b>
<b>\$5,899</b>	<b>TOTAL OTHER CHARGES</b>

## ACQUISITIONS AND MAJOR REPAIRS

\$33,896	Replacement vehicle and computer equipment
<b>\$33,896</b>	<b>TOTAL ACQUISITIONS AND MAJOR REPAIRS</b>